SINGLE BENCH

(4)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 345 OF 2007

PETITIONER : Vijay Kumar Son of Sri Awan Sai, aged about 21 years, resident of village : Maheshpur, Post : Lakshmangarh, Block : Udaypur, District : Surguja (C G)

P.F. No. 284/07 & 1/2K Pandey
Presented on 9/1/07
dated

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur.

2. The Collector, Ambikapur, District : Surguja (C.G)

RECEIVED COPY 9/1/07
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

3. The Commissioner, National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Vikas Bhavan, Civil Lines, Raipur (C.G)

4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Panchayat, Surguja, (Ambikapur), District : Surguja - C.G.

5. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Udaypur, Block : Udaypur, District : Surguja (C.G).

6. Rupan Singh, Son of Sri Ramanand Ram, aged about 20 years, resident of village : Maheshpur, Post : Lakshmangarh, Block : Udaypur, District : Surguja (C G).

(5)

7. Sri Ramanand Ram, Sarpanch,
of Village Panchayat : Manpur,
Janpad Panchayat Udaypur,
District : Surguja (C G).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 / ~~227~~ OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, WRIT, DIRECTION ... ... ETC.

(36)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION (S.) NO.345 OF 2007

Petitioner : Vijay Kumar

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Mr. V.K.Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State/ respondents No.1 to 3.

ORDER

(Passed on 22nd Day of January, 2007)

The petitioner made an application for appointment on the post of Gram Rojgar Sahayak pursuant to an advertisement issued by respondent No.4. According to him, the last date for submission of the application was 10-10-2006. Respondent No.6, son of respondent No.7, who happens to be a Sarpanch, made an application beyond the specified period, i.e., 10-10-2006 and the same was accepted. Respondent No.6 was appointed also.

2. Being aggrieved, the petitioner moved to the District Collector as well as to the Director, Panchayat, as prescribed under the rules. While pending appeals/revisions before the aforementioned authorities, the petitioner has filed this petition.

(37)

3. This petition is not maintainable on account of the fact that the petitioner has already moved the statutory authorities to avail alternative remedy. This petition is premature.

4. Thus, this petition is dismissed as not maintainable, without expressing any opinion on merit. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal